

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

18th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XVIII, No.10

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

June 1, 1988

House Committee Rejects Big Budget Boost for NSF

For the second straight year, the House Appropriations Committee has declined to go along with a series of proposed increases aimed at doubling the budget of the National Science Foundation between 1988-92. NSF emerged from the markup of its appropriations bill by the full Committee on May 25 with a respectable 9.8-percent increase over the current figure. But the goal of a 19-percent increase, initially rejected at the Subcommittee level, failed to win a reprieve from the full Committee.

The verdict, for fiscal 1989, which begins next October 1, is not likely to be reversed by the full House. In fact, NSF officials fear that the House figure—\$1.9 billion rather than the requested \$2.1 billion—may be a ceiling rather than a floor. Still to be heard from is the Senate Appropriations Committee, where William Proxmire (D-Wisc.) chairs the NSF Subcommittee. In the past, Proxmire has fought against any increase for NSF. His Subcommittee is under espe-

cially intense pressure this year to satisfy the budget requests of other agencies within its jurisdiction.

The House bill knocked out the separate \$150-million item that NSF requested for starting a new program of Science and Technology Centers with full funding in the bank for five years. The proposed financing arrangement, an unusual one in NSF budgeting, was designed to quell fears that centers are basically a threat to "little science," and that in a budget pinch, they would have first call on NSF's resources. The full Appropriations Committee, endorsing recommendations by the Subcommittee headed by NSF's money master in the House, Edward P. Boland (D-Mass.), raised the NSF research budget by 8.6 percent and recommended that some of those funds be used to start a "limited number" of centers.

There's a way of interpreting the House budget action that makes it appear a little less harsh. If the

(Continued on page 3)

Q&A: With Director Wyngaarden On Political Troubles at NIH

James B. Wyngaarden, Director of the National Institutes of Health, spoke with SGR Editor Greenberg on May 11. Following is the text, transcribed and edited by SGR.

Q. NIH suddenly has political problems—the latest being the highly publicized firing of one of your senior administrators, Ted Becker, from the sensitive job of chief of procurement for your laboratories (SGR May 15).

Wyngaarden. About 18 months ago, we had a major confrontation with the Department [of Health and Human Services, NIH's parent agency] over the management of procurement. We negotiated a corrective-action plan. Ted agreed to that, and submitted quarterly reports as to the progress that he was making. He felt that all of the residual deficiencies that had been identified were being addressed.

The Department didn't really agree with that. But Ted then asked on his own initiative for an outside audit from the Logistics Management Institute (LMI), which is a group at the Defense Department that does this sort of audit for other branches of the government. Ted wanted to get somebody completely outside the PHS [Public Health Service, the administrative umbrella of

(Continued on page 2)

In Brief

The Superconducting Super Collider (SSC) will go into a holding pattern until the next Administration takes office, if the House and Senate accept the recommendation of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Energy. Citing budget pressures, the Subcommittee voted only \$100 million of the \$363 million sought for the SSC for fiscal 1989, and earmarked the money "to continue planning to better determine cost, financial participation from non-Federal sources, and other details of design in light of breakthroughs in technology" The Subcommittee added that DOE's record for staying within budget estimates is "very poor."

Citing Rep. John Dingell's tumultuous hearing April 12 on scientific fraud (SGR April 15, May 1), David Baltimore, Director of the Whitehead Institute, has sent a nine-page letter to scientists around the country warning that "we are undergoing a harbinger of threats to scientific communication and scientific freedom. The halls of Congress are not the place to determine scientific truth or falsity." Baltimore is a co-author of a paper whose accuracy was challenged at the Congressional hearing.

Want to donate unneeded scientific journals and books to research organizations in developing countries? For information: Professor R. Dalafi, Third World Academy of Sciences, c/o International Center for Theoretical Physics, PO Box 586, 34100 Trieste, Italy.

...Heading Off a "Potentially Explosive Situation"

(Continued from page 1)

NIH] to look at it, and I think fully expected to get very high marks across the board.

They did give him extraordinarily high marks from the standpoint of procurement services. There was a level of satisfaction within NIH that they rarely find in a government agency. They, however, did fault the agency as a whole for a lack of adequate cost consciousness, and Ted and his unit for not having achieved the kinds of discounts that they thought we would have been entitled to with such a large-scale volume.

They contrasted the NIH with a number of private institutions, most closely with [Johns] Hopkins, which they thought was compositionally and functionally rather like NIH and about the same size. And Hopkins does have better discount rates than we did. But the system is not the same. There's a centralized procurement at Hopkins. Everything is delivered to one place and the costs of disbursement within the institution don't show up as a procurement cost. So, they're not strictly comparable. They also felt that we had not been adhering to procurement regulations, primarily with respect to exceptions to competitive bids, and that we have not adhered to some of the requirements for contracting with small businesses or minority businesses, on occasion.

At any rate, at that point the [HHS] Inspector General received the draft of this LMI report, and reacted pretty vigorously and wrote the [HHS] Secretary proposing that Ted be removed from this position and transferred outside of NIH. Ted is an SES [Senior Executive Service, the elite of the Civil Service] employee and the Secretary has that prerogative of reassignment. He also proposed that Ted be permanently debarred from any role in procurement activities. He cited a figure that was floated up about a year and a half ago of a \$25 million inefficiency. With a little inflation, he made it \$26 million.

Q. Is that a plausible number?

Wyngaarden. No. I don't think so. It was, I thought at the time, a reckless estimate, but it has achieved a life of its own. It's a damaging figure. A much closer estimate by the personnel who conducted this LMI study is maybe 20 percent of that, maybe a little more. And I think that is a plausible figure. But I would not characterize that as waste in the system. I would characterize that as further economies that could be attained. There's also a large question in everyone's mind whether if we drove the system to the point of its last potential dollar of saving, whether we'd have the procurement system that would be responsive. Our business is to do research, and I think the business of administration is to make the research as efficient as possible. But in the procurement regulations there are just two considerations. One is

fiscal responsibility and the other is compliance.

We are still going back and forth on some of these issues. But the vigor of the Inspector General's response and the feeling within the Department that we had a potentially explosive situation that needed quick surgical correction prevailed. And I would have to say that everyone with whom I have dealt and have argued this issue in the Department genuinely believes that he is acting in the best interests of NIH. And I do not fault them for that. We have a different perspective on it. I think we still can make the changes indicated with a less severe corrective program.

Q. The sentence for Becker seems to be especially harsh. Why couldn't he simply return to the bench, as he apparently wished to?

Wyngaarden. We've asked the same question. The people who live in the more political world than we do say that would look like a partial rather than a complete solution. They were very anxious to have this matter settled before the first Congressional inquiry arose. And we have had Congressional inquiries. We had appropriations hearings in the Senate later than usual this year. This broke just before that. After my opening statement, the first question I received from Senator Chiles [D-Fla., Chairman of the NIH Appropriations Subcommittee] had to do with procurement at NIH.

Q. Was the report on NIH procurement circulating in Congress?

Wyngaarden. Yes, it had by that point. He asked me about the \$26 million figure. I said I thought it was a hyperbolic statement. I thought the actual figure was perhaps half that, perhaps less.

Q. In your talk to the assembly at NIH [on April 29] you referred to a "\$5-million warning shot across the bow."

Wyngaarden. The House Appropriations Committee was marking up a Supplemental bill. When it finished the process, they were essentially \$20 million over a
(Continued on page 3)

ISSN 0048-9581

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1988

Editor and Publisher

Daniel S. Greenberg

European Correspondent

Francois Segulier (Paris)

Associate Publisher

Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager

Glen D. Grant

Independently published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscription: Institutions, \$225.00 (two years, \$395.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, D.C. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date.

... NIH Now Experiencing the "Downside of Politics"

(Continued from page 2)

target figure. They elected to take, or it was proposed taking, \$5 million of that from our two accounts that deal with procurement.

Q. Did they directly state this was a warning?

Wyngaarden. Informally, yes, from the Chairman by the way of the Committee chief of staff.

Q. Now, your showdown meeting with the three representatives from the Department on April 22.

Wyngaarden. I had asked to meet with the IG [Inspector General of HHS.] The Under Secretary [of HHS, Don M. Newman] then called me, and I gave him the NIH side and felt that the treatment of Ted, a loyal intramural scientist who had foregone eight years of his own scientific career as a service to his colleagues and to NIH—I thought the least we could have done would be to thank him profusely for his contributions and allow him to resume his scientific career. But that wasn't the verdict.

Q. Was this discussed at the meeting with the three from the Department?

Wyngaarden. It was first discussed on the telephone with the Under Secretary. He said, "What should we do?" I said, "I'd like to meet with the Inspector General." And so that meeting was set up. At the last minute, the Inspector General was unable to come, but he asked Tony McCann, the Assistant Secretary for Management and Budget, to represent him. And the Under Secretary was there. And Ralph Reed, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health.

The main discussion was between myself, representing NIH, and Tony McCann, representing the Department and the IG. It was clear as we talked that the

Under Secretary accepted the recommendation of the IG [to remove Becker from his administrative post and debar him from returning to research at NIH] in this matter. I made it clear that I could not voluntarily agree to that. And so this essentially became an order for me to proceed.

Q. Did you threaten to resign?

Wyngaarden. No, I did not. I must say, it passed through my mind, but I didn't think this was the issue.

Q. Was there any suggestion of personal wrongdoing by Becker?

Wyngaarden. No. The intramural community [staff in NIH's own laboratories], when they heard about this, assumed there had to be more. And I went back before my meeting with the intramural scientists [on April 29]—I went back by telephone both to Ralph Reed and to Tony McCann to find out if there was any more. They assured me that there was no intimation of impropriety that had to do with what is called fiduciary responsibility. They assured me that there was no implication of impropriety. There were rumors that, for this severe an action, Ted must have been embezzling something. There is no truth to that.

It is simply, as someone nicely stated, a clash of two cultures. It was pointed out, for example, that while NIH is an intensely political creation, and we have a fairly brisk political existence, we predominantly see the upside of politics. This is a bit of the downside of politics. When something happens, and gets to a state of this degree of concern, one might even say the facts don't matter any more. Perception takes over.

Q. The IG's letter notes Congressional concern about
(Continued on page 4)

NSF Budget (Continued from page 1)

rejected \$150-million centers item is apportioned over five years, the requested increase for fiscal 1989 works out to 12 percent, rather than 19 percent. The outcome, then, is not too remote from the 9.8-percent increase that was actually voted. But this numbers game does not lessen the injury for NSF, whose clients in academe have been clamoring about tight budgets and occasional cutbacks on promised funds.

As was the case last year, the House Committee expressed strong support for NSF's education programs, which are popular in Congress but low in the priorities list of the NSF management. Education was voted \$15 million more than was requested, for a total of \$171 million, and the Committee directed NSF to devote two-thirds of the increase to teacher training.

The rebuff in the House comes after two years of missionary work by NSF Director Erich Bloch and other members of the Washington science establishment. They have keyed NSF's growth to competitiveness, superconductivity, national security, and just about anything else that could plausibly be tied to rapid budget growth for the Foundation. Last year, the money was all but delivered when the October stock market crash set off a frenzy of budget reductions on Capitol Hill.

This year's verdict came early and in an orderly fashion. The culprit isn't a Congressional lack of affection for science. Rather, it's the relentless deficit-cutting process and the system of pitting disparate programs against each other within the appropriations subcommittees. NSF, for example, must compete with subsidized housing for the poor, veterans assistance, and NASA—all long-neglected.

... Politics Feels Doubts About Honesty in Science

(Continued from page 3)

misconduct in research—an obvious reference to the recent Congressional hearings on scientific fraud (SGR April 15, May 1, 15).

Wyngaarden. Yes, there's that. But we have had some other events. We had the hearing on the personnel appraisal system [March 31, before the House Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, Chaired by Rep. John D. Dingell (D-Mich.), after HHS said NIH had inflated the performance ratings for senior administrators]. Just a week before the Becker incident, we had this very difficult hearing on misconduct and fraud in science. We also had an issue which at that time was surfacing and has since grown larger—on the use of fetal tissue in transplantation. We have the continuing matter of animals in science. [Assistant Secretary] Tony McCann said, "There's blood in the water around NIH, and the sharks are circling." They wanted to get rid of this problem in a decisive manner immediately, given the other events that had occurred.

Q. Looking at some of the events, in particular, the Dingell hearing [April 12, on scientific fraud], it seems that regardless of the merits, that hearing went badly for NIH.

Wyngaarden. I understand it did, very badly. I don't know if I'm glad I was chairing the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] meeting in Paris that week, or not. We've had a difficult spring, and that hearing has not helped.

Q. What do you do for damage control? Dingell's staff is rummaging around in Cambridge this week for additional material. As one of Dingell's staff people said about fraud cases, "They're coming out of the closet now." There are plenty of people with grievances, justified or imagined, who are looking to tell a story. Now they have a place to tell it.

Wyngaarden. I think that's happening. What I perceive from observing this event during six years here, and the hearings and comments surrounding them, is that there are some in the Congress who feel that the rather privileged status of the universities, the scientists, and the whole biomedical research enterprise has led to a certain complacency about some of these problems. They're coming to the conclusion that scientists are no more honest than businessmen, and that universities are no more honorable than corporations. I think that there's a tremendous backlash against the perception that there's a very high purpose to education, research, and science that makes these events unlikely, except as aberrations.

I still like that point of view, and by and large subscribe to it. But there's no question—we've been badly damaged by these celebrated cases of misconduct and

mismanagement. And by the reluctance to admit that there have been problems. Especially in the [John] Darsee case [in which extensive fraud in biomedical research at Harvard and Emory University was disclosed in 1981]. We had this protracted denial, or at least extraordinary effort to come out Mr. Clean on everything, when we had no possibility of coming out that way.

Q. Are you referring to Harvard's own investigation, which exonerated all but Darsee?

Wyngaarden. Yes, and even the manner in which this was approached by some of the principals along the way.

Q. At Harvard?

Wyngaarden. Yes.

Q. So, this festers on seven years later?

Wyngaarden. Yes, it continues to cost us, I think.

Q. Is there any way to mend this situation before it causes further damage?

Wyngaarden. There may be. I would very much dislike to see the proposed solution of an Inspector General-like mechanism set up in the Department with authority for unannounced site visits and primary evaluation of notebooks without there being some sort of cause for this. On the other hand, I think that we have to be a lot more vigorous about this. I've been concerned about a number of cases that have been under review at the NIH over the years, but I'm not part of the investigative process. As the Director, I'm the deciding official. I'm deliberately enjoined from entering the process. I'm supposed to be uninvolved until the end.

Q. There's nothing to prevent you from knocking heads and getting a couple of dozen people together and saying, let's figure out some more effective way of dealing with the fraud issue.

Wyngaarden. Immediately following the [Dingell] hearing, I added two positions to the investigative office. We detailed someone who had substantial investi-

(Continued on page 5)

WGBH Gets Grant for AIDS Series

A grant of nearly \$4 million has been awarded to WGBH-TV, Boston, by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation for the production of programs on AIDS. The grant will finance a quarterly series, scheduled to begin late this fall, plus three one-hour documentaries, sponsorship of international co-productions, and a "national educational outreach program." The Johnson Foundation says that it has committed \$27 million to a variety of AIDS-related programs, and describes itself as "the leading private funder in that area."

... Feder, Stewart Acting Within "Permissible" Range

(Continued from page 4)

gative experience from one of our audit units, and I think we have now identified the second new person to put into that unit, someone who has epidemiological and biostatistical and sociological experience. So, I think it will be much stronger.

We have to be more vigorous in joining with the universities in the investigation. I still think the primary responsibility is properly placed on the institution. It's a form of activity that none of us has much experience with. With each example, we learn some additional procedural devices. A school that has had its first major case, as the Darsee case was at Harvard, is much better prepared for the second, and so on. That showed up in subsequent events that have occurred at Harvard. The handling was with dispatch and skill. We are advocating that every grantee institution be prepared for that. But the Departmental proposal on how to deal with misconduct in science has just been returned from the Office of Management and Budget for some additional study [SGR May 15].

Q. OMB says that you're too strict, that too much conformity might be imposed on science.

Wyngaarden. There are basically two points. One is that the document dealt with misconduct in science. They would prefer to see us define what is fraud in science and deal with that. In one sense, it's too broad. The second point is a question of whether NIH or other branches of the Public Health Service should not have more of an investigative unit in a sense that the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) does. They apparently conduct site visits to laboratories engaged in studies that will be submitted to the FDA. I would hope that we can limit that to events that warrant such inquiry, but I do think that we've got to be much more aggressive in looking at those cases.

Q. You've got an odd situation at NIH where two of your staff scientists [Walter Stewart and Ned Feder] are running a sort of guerrilla campaign against fraud. And often, at least in Congressman Dingell's perception, they're way ahead of the established organ for this purpose. Is this situation likely to continue?

Wyngaarden. Stewart and Feder are not part of the official NIH investigative mechanism. They became interested in this line of endeavor, largely through the Darsee case, and there's been a lot of discussion as to whether this is appropriate activity for intramural scientists whose job description, originally at least, was that of doing organic chemical syntheses. We have taken a point of view that many of our people do things other than their primary bench science obligations. Some of these alternative activities can be broadly categorized as making contributions to the integrity of science.

For example, we have many people who serve on editorial boards, some serve as editors of journals, and so on. And that is, in another sense, a kind of quality control of science. So, in the generic sense, what Stewart and Feder are doing is not that different. Our attorneys point out that we have traditionally allowed a lot of latitude. I guess you'd call it academic freedom, although we're not strictly academic.

Q. They say that maintaining the purity of science is just as important as the expansion of scientific knowledge. But there are people who say that they were hired to work in a laboratory.

Wyngaarden. As you can imagine, we have enormous ambivalence about what they're doing.

Q. Will they be permitted to continue with their present work practices?

Wyngaarden. Yes.

Q. Then you perceive their activity as being beneficial to science or it is regarded as something that a liberal scientific community tolerates?

Wyngaarden. I think it's within that broad range of activities that is permissible in the [NIH] intramural program.

Q. Would you like to see NIH privatized under one or another formula that would take it out of the US government (SGR March 15)?

Wyngaarden. No, I would not. Privatization can mean a number of things. When this was first floated, some of our people said, "Great, I hope Otis buys us and gets our elevators running." I don't think any kind of tumultuous change is needed at the NIH. There are basically two areas in which we are having considerable problems. One has to do with the salary scale and fringe benefits—the disparity between what we can offer and what's offered by academia and industry. The disparity is greater than it's ever been and we're losing too many quality people.

The second is that we would seek a good deal more administrative control over our activities. We are subject to all the same controls as other branches of government. Right now, like other branches of government, we are being "downsized." We have lost well over a thousand FTE's [full-time equivalent staff members] over the last several years. We've gained some in AIDS, but we've lost people in the non-AIDS category. And we're very tightly tethered to the Department on key decisions. The paperwork to get policy decisions through can be very, very slow. On the regulations for misconduct in science, I signed off on it more than a year ago. It's just now come back from OMB. It's a ponderous system. As the pace of science increases, we need to be much more responsive than we can be.

(Continued on page 6)

In Print: NASA, Fraud, Space Telescope, Infertility

The following publications are obtainable as indicated—not from SGR.

Two from the Congressional Budget Office:

The NASA Program in the 1990s and Beyond (85 pp.), another production from the booming whither-NASA? industry, this one warns that without big budget increases, the US space program will be confined to a limited "core" program. But, the CBO notes, "new and ambitious initiatives beyond the core program, such as a lunar outpost or a manned expedition to Mars at the end of the century, could more than triple NASA's current real budget by 2000."

Using Federal R&D to Promote Commercial Innovation (82 pp.), examines various suggestions for extracting greater commercial payoff from government R&D, warning, however, that the agencies closest to the civilian sector—the National Science Foundation, the National Bureau of Standards, and the Pentagon—lack "expertise to determine the particular industries and technologies that would benefit from government assistance." A possible solution, says the CBO, is "to expand the mission of one of these agencies"—or to create a new agency.

Single copies available without charge. Order from: Congressional Budget Office, Publications, House Annex No. 2, Room 413, 2d and D Sts. SW, Washington, DC 20515. Include a self-addressed mailing label. Tel. 202/226-2809.

Project on Scientific Fraud and Misconduct (136 pp.), report of a workshop, in September 1987, held by the National Conference of Lawyers and Scientists, a creation of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the American Bar Association. Topics covered include estimates of incidence of fraud

NIH

(Continued from page 5)

Q. *Then is a government-owned, contractor-operator format desirable, let's say along the lines of the Department of Energy's (DOE) big labs?*

Wyngaarden. At the suggestion of OMB, we've contracted with the National Academy of Sciences for a study. We're hoping they'll look at all the opportunities. It might be that a role as a graduate school of biological science would make us sufficiently different, such that we could enjoy some of the special provisions that have been accorded to the Uniformed Services University [of the Health Sciences, a Pentagon-supported medical school and research facility, near NIH, in Bethesda, Md.]

They have a salary scale that's very different from the rest of the Civil Service or the military. And it enables

and misconduct, due process for the accused, the role of institutions, and problems encountered by whistleblowers.

No charge. Order from: AAAS, Office of Public Sector Programs, 1333 H St. NW, Washington, DC 20005; tel. 202/326-6600.

Space Science: Status of the Hubble Space Telescope Program (28 pp.), report by the General Accounting Office (GAO) detailing the colossal expenditures that have been incurred by the space telescope, still grounded by the collapse of the shuttle program. Cost overruns in design and construction, plus storage (at \$8 million a month), will bring the price to \$1.5 billion by the scheduled launch date, June 1989, GAO reports. Through 1993, the total is estimated at \$2.8 billion.

No charge. Order from: GAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20877; tel. 202/275-6241.

Reviews of National Science and Technology Policy: Denmark (120 pp.), latest in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's series on S&T policies of the 24 OECD member nations.

OECD publications are available at OCED offices and book-sellers in many major cities throughout the world. In the US (price \$19.80), order from: OECD Publications and Information Center, Suite 700, 2000 L St. NW, Washington, DC 20036-4095; tel. 202/785-6323.

Infertility: Medical and Social Choices (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01090-7; 402 pp.), report by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, says that Americans spent about \$1 billion on conception services in 1987, and that 5 percent of births were involved. The
(Continued on page 7)

them to pay their senior personnel up to the limit of the average salaries of the five medical schools in Baltimore and Washington. That means that they can pay twice what we can. We need some kind of special relief of that sort. If becoming a graduate university justifies it, that may be something we should do. It's been proposed for 20 years for other reasons. And there's considerable enthusiasm for that. Whether it should be operated the way Oak Ridge [National Laboratory, the DOE contractor-operated facility in Tennessee] has been for years, or some other arrangement of government-owned, contractor-operated, I don't know.

I'm encouraged by all the attention to the problems of NIH. These problems have now been recognized at the highest levels in the Department and at OMB and in the Congress. And they've even been commented on by the White House. So, we have somebody's attention, and that's the first step.

Data Sought on Exclusion of US Firms from Foreign R&D

The US Department of Commerce has asked industrial firms to report instances in which they are excluded from participating in cooperative research and development activities with foreign R&D organizations. The request, stemming from political pressures for international equity in access to R&D, reflects the growing application of protectionist measures to the exchange of scientific and technical data and personnel.

In making the request, the Department cited a 1987 Presidential Executive Order that requires directors of US government laboratories to consider American access abroad in allowing foreigners into their facilities. In an announcement in the April 21 *Federal Register*, the Department stated that it is "particularly interested in specific information concerning (a) the denial by foreign governments of opportunities to do research in foreign facilities or to enter into formal cooperative relationships; and (b) the effect of current US policies governing foreign access to federal laboratories on private-sector willingness to enter into cooperative agreements with such laboratories."

The Commerce announcement also stated that under the Executive Order, federal agencies, in negotiating cooperative or licensing agreements with foreign firms or individuals, are required to "consider whether the foreign government involved (a) has policies to protect US intellectual property rights and (b) has adequate national security export controls."

In Print (Continued from page 6)

study examines costs, ethical issues, legal aspects, access to services, and policies and practices in other nations.

\$16.00. Order from: Superintendent of Documents, USGPO, Washington, DC 20402; tel. 202/783-3238.

Analysis of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (88-205 SPR; 77 pp.), from the Science Policy Research Division of the Congressional Research Service (CRS—part of the Library of Congress) for the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee. Written by Genevieve J. Knezo, Specialist in Science and Technology, the report pulls together recent commentaries on OSTP by academics, journalists, and scientific and political figures; many are unfavorable about recent OSTP performance.

CRS reports are directly available only to members of Congress, but members usually will fulfill a request from a constituent, or even a non-constituent. Specify that the document is from the Congressional Research Service and give the full title and identifying number (as above). The Capitol switchboard: 202/224-3121.

Job Changes & Appointments

John A. White, Professor of Engineering at Georgia Tech, has been appointed Assistant Director for Engineering at the National Science Foundation, effective July 18, succeeding **Nam P. Suh**, who returned last year to MIT. **Mary L. Good**, President of engineered-materials research at Allied Signal Corp., has been elected Chairman of the National Science Board, NSF's policy-making body. She succeeds **Roland W. Schmitt**, President of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, whose term expired last month.

Jon M. Veigel, Executive Director of the Alternative Energy Corporation, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, has been appointed Executive Director of Oak Ridge Associated Universities, a consortium of research and educational institutions associated with the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Tenn. He succeeds **William E. Felling**.

John A. Norris, Deputy Commissioner and Chief Operating Officer of the Food and Drug Administration since 1985, has joined Hill and Knowlton, Inc., which describes itself as "the world's largest public affairs, public relations, and corporate consulting firm."

Hearing Set on Revamping NIH

Proposals for the revamping of the National Institutes of Health (SGR March 15) will be the subject of a public hearing June 13, from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm, at the National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418. The hearing will be conducted by the Committee to Study Strategies to Strengthen the Scientific Excellence of the National Institutes of Health. The Committee, chaired by Harold T. Shapiro, President of Princeton University, was created by the Institute of Medicine, the health-policy arm of the Academy, at the suggestion of the Office of Management and Budget. Persons wishing to testify or to submit material for a published record should contact: Michael Millman, Institute of Medicine, 2133 Wisconsin Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20007; tel. 202/334-2339.

Grant Swinger Papers, SGR Binders

The Grant Swinger Papers, D. S. Greenberg's spoof on grantland (32 pp.), is available for \$4.95 per copy (add \$2 for overseas airmail.) Also available: Embossed looseleaf binders that can hold two annual volumes of SGR (40 issues), for \$8.95 each (add \$5 for overseas airmail).

Order from: SGR, PO Box 6226, Washington, DC 20015. Please include payment with order.

Dukakis Aide Sketches Views on Shifts in R&D Policy

What R&D policy views are stirring in the Dukakis camp? Little has come out on the campaign trail, but a glimpse was provided last week by the Democratic frontrunner's Issues Director, Christopher Edley Jr., a Harvard Law Professor.

Speaking in Washington to a meeting of Coretech, an academic-industrial lobby devoted to boosting R&D, Edley responded to a question about Dukakis and R&D as follows:

"I'll mention a few areas where, it seems to me, there are tremendous opportunities for a new Administration . . . to make some adjustments. First and perhaps most obviously is the question of civilian R&D by the federal government—the tremendous tilt toward DOD military R&D that has skewed our . . . scientific base. And . . . we would argue not necessarily entirely with good results in terms of national security or economic security. So, that's number one.

"Number two, NASA's priorities [on which he said nothing more]. Number three, DOE priorities, including, in a Dukakis Administration, less interest in far-horizon fusion research, more interest in things that are closer to commercialization and substantial civilian spinoffs.

"Number 4, USDA (Department of Agriculture) priorities. There's almost a \$900-million research budget in USDA. I think it's between three and four cents of every research dollar in USDA that gets spent on new technologies, new uses, with the balance going into increased productivity, if you can believe it. I mean, increased productivity is not exactly what we need from the farm sector right now . . .

"Next, technology dissemination across the board, in DOD, in NASA, in Energy, in several other agencies. I think modest increases in the budget allocations for technology dissemination could yield substantial benefits . . . Export promotion is similar. The Governor [Dukakis] believes very strongly that export promotion for medium- and small-size firms, as opposed to multinationals, decentralized export promotion activities, where the federal government works in partnership with state government and with the private sector, to effectively market high-value-added goods overseas, is another one where a small investment could have a large payoff . . .

"Finally . . . the [research] centers of excellence idea, which is . . . something that the Governor feels a very strong attraction to himself, and [it] fits very well . . . with the public-private partnership, collaboration that's going to be essential, especially in a time of limited federal resources."

Asked whether he was confusing agricultural productivity with agricultural production, Edley bumbled around in a fashion that suggested he was on unfamiliar ground. In response to a question about science advisers in the Dukakis campaign, Edley said Dukakis was shunning the appointment of "gurus" because "we don't want the press to use any advisers as a proxy for the candidate." He added, however, that the "two people who have been most helpful to us on science issues" are David Baltimore, Director of the Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research, at MIT, and Lewis Branscomb, former IBM Chief Scientist, now Director of the Science, Technology, and Public Policy Program at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INC.
SERIALS ACQUISITIONS
300 N. ZEEB RD.
ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

